

# One-loop spectrum of the minimal calculable unified model [1]



Timon Mede<sup>‡</sup>, Lukáš Gráf, Michal Malinský, Vasja Susič



<sup>‡</sup>Faculty of Science, University of Zagreb, CROATIA, tmede@phy.hr

## Motivation

**Experiment :**

future **proton decay** searches (DUNE, Hyper-K, ...)  $\rightarrow$   $\mathcal{O}(10)$  increase in  $\tau_p(p^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+, K^+ \bar{\nu})$  sensitivity

**Theory :**

proton lifetime estimates plagued by large **uncertainties**

**Matching experimental efforts requires improving the theoretical predictions for  $\tau_p$  by NLO calculation**

## Theoretical uncertainties

Main sources of uncertainties in  $\tau_p$  estimates in GUTs

- **hadronic matrix elements**  $\langle \pi^{+,0}, K^{+,0}, \eta | \dots | p^+ \rangle$   
lattice/ $\chi$ PT  $\rightarrow \Delta \sim \mathcal{O}(20 - 40\%)$
  - **flavour structure of the BLV currents**
    - \* partial widths  $\Gamma(p^+ \rightarrow \text{final state})$  in general depend on unknown *rotation matrices*
    - \* **Planck scale effects :**  
 $\Delta \sim \mathcal{O}(1\%)$  inaccuracy in Yukawa fits due to *shifts in  $d = 4$  matching*  $\rightarrow$  potentially large changes in the *mixing angles* and *BLV currents*
  - **effective mediator mass “ $M_{GUT}$ ” determination:**  
in non-SUSY predominantly **heavy gauge bosons :**  
 $(3, 2, -\frac{5}{6})$  or  $(3, 2, +\frac{1}{6}) \rightarrow \tau_p \propto \alpha_{GUT}^{-1} \frac{M_{GUT}^4}{m_p^5}$
- @ NLO:
- \* running of  $\alpha_i$  @ **2-loop** ( $\Delta \alpha_i^{exp}(m_Z)$ )
  - \* **threshold effects @ 1-loop** (scalar spectrum)
  - \* **Planck scale effects:**  $d = 5$  gauge kinetic form operators cause uncontrolled & inhomogeneous *shifts in matching*  $\rightarrow \Delta M_{GUT} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^3)$

## The minimal calculable model

**SO(10) GUT spontaneously broken by scalar 45 :**

leading Planck-scale operators *absent* (group theory)

$$\mathcal{L} \propto \frac{\langle 45 \rangle}{M_P} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} = 0$$

$\omega_b, \omega_r \subset \langle 45 \rangle$  breaks **SO(10)**,  $\chi \subset \langle 16 \rangle$  or  $\sigma \subset \langle 126 \rangle$  reduces *rank*

- **renormalizable SUSY 45  $\oplus$  16:**  
 $\langle 45 \rangle \times \langle 16 \rangle = 1_{SU(5)} \rightarrow$  no breaking to SM **X**
- **renormalizable non-SUSY 45  $\oplus$  16 [2]:**  
 $m_{\nu_R} \sim 10^4$  GeV, non-renormalizable Yukawas **X**
- **renormalizable non-SUSY 45  $\oplus$  126 [3]:**  
**@ tree level : RULED OUT** **X**  
**tachyonic spectrum** or **flipped SU(5) vacuum** [4, 5, 6]

$$\left. \begin{aligned} m_{(8,1,0)_{45}}^2 &\propto (\omega_b - \omega_r)(2\omega_b + \omega_r) > 0 \\ m_{(1,3,0)_{45}}^2 &\propto (\omega_r - \omega_b)(\omega_b + 2\omega_r) > 0 \end{aligned} \right\} \rightarrow -2 < \frac{\omega_b}{\omega_r} < -\frac{1}{2}$$

**@ 1-loop : QUANTUM SALVATION** **??**

potentially **realistic spectrum** (non-tachyonic, perturbative, seesaw scale  $\sigma$ ) in the region where **1-loop radiative corrections** to masses *dominate*

## Effective potential approach

Expansion of **Coleman-Weinberg effective potential** [7] and VEVs in number of loops ( $\hbar$ ):

$$V = V_0 + \frac{\hbar}{64\pi^2} \text{Tr} \left[ \mathbf{M}_S^4(\phi) \left( \log \frac{\mathbf{M}_S^2(\phi)}{\mu_r^2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) + 3\mathbf{M}_G^4(\phi) \left( \log \frac{\mathbf{M}_G^2(\phi)}{\mu_r^2} - \frac{5}{6} \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$$

**Stationary conditions** for the scalar potential determine the **vacuum state**:

$$0 = \partial_a V|_v \rightarrow v = v_0 + \hbar v_1 + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$$

**1-loop scalar masses** correspond to the **eigenvalues** of the matrix (in the vacuum state):

$$\mathbf{M}_{ab}^2 \equiv \partial_a \partial_b V|_v = \partial_a \partial_b V_0|_{v_0 + \hbar v_1} + \hbar \partial_a \partial_b V_1|_{v_0} + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2)$$

producing **scalar & gauge** loop contributions of the **polynomial & logarithmic** kind:

$$m_{x,1\text{-loop}}^2 := m_{x,\text{tree}}^2 + \Delta_x^{G[\text{poly}]} + \Delta_x^{G[\log]} + \Delta_x^{S_{FIN}[\text{poly}]} + \Delta_x^{S_{INF}[\text{poly}]} + \Delta_x^{S[\log]}$$

## Pseudo-Goldstone boson masses: various CHECKS

- **exact Goldstones**  $(3, 2, -\frac{5}{6})_{45} \oplus (\bar{3}, 2, +\frac{5}{6})_{45}$  remain massless even @ 1-loop **✓**
  - various **limits** (*spontaneous symmetry breaking patterns*):
- |                 | $\omega_b \neq 0, \omega_r \neq 0$ | $\omega_b = 0, \omega_r \neq 0$ | $\omega_b \neq 0, \omega_r = 0$ | $\omega_b = \omega_r \neq 0$ | $\omega_b = -\omega_r \neq 0$ |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| $\sigma = 0$    | $3_c 2_L 1_R 1_{B-L}$              | $4_c 2_L 1_R$                   | $3_c 2_L 2_R 1_{B-L}$           | $5 1_Z$                      | $5' 1_{Z'}$                   |
| $\sigma \neq 0$ | $3_c 2_L 1_Y$                      | $3_c 2_L 1_Y$                   | $3_c 2_L 1_Y$                   | $5$                          | $3_c 2_L 1_Y$                 |
- $\omega_b = \omega_r$ : **SU(5)**  $\rightarrow m_{(8,1,0)_{45}}^2 = m_{(1,3,0)_{45}}^2 = 0$  (**24-plet** with  $(3, 2, -\frac{5}{6})_{45}$ ) **✓**
  - $\omega_b = -\omega_r$ : **flipped SU(5)**  $\rightarrow m_{(8,1,0)_{45}}^2 = m_{(1,3,0)_{45}}^2$  (**24-plet** with  $(3, 2, +\frac{1}{6})_{45}$ ) **✓**
- highly non-trivial check (**poly**  $\leftrightarrow$  **log** in the infinite series of nested commutators)
- **diagrammatic** computation of **gauge polynomial** and leading **scalar polynomial** ( $\tau^2$ ) contributions:  $\Delta_{(8,1,0)_{45}}^{\tau^2[\text{poly}]} = \Delta_{(1,3,0)_{45}}^{\tau^2[\text{poly}]} = \frac{35\tau^2}{8\pi^2}$  **✓**

## Viable spectrum sample

- **PGBs @ 1-loop:**  $\frac{m_{(8,1,0)_{45}}}{\omega_b} = 0.35$ ,  $\frac{m_{(1,3,0)_{45}}}{\omega_b} = 0.27$
  - **rest of the spectrum @ tree-level:**  $1.4 \leq \frac{m_i}{\omega_b} \leq 3.7$  (5 Goldstones + 4 PGBs)
- non-tachyonic spectrum **✓**    perturbativity **✓**    seesaw scale **✓**
- TO DO:**
- $\gggg$  SM singlet pseudo-Goldstones @ 1-loop: non-tachyonic?
  - $\gggg$  gauge coupling unification (2-loop RGEs)?
  - $\gggg$  phenomenologically viable point?

## Conclusions

**Ultimate goal:** improve accuracy of  $\tau_p$  estimates  $\rightarrow$  **mediator mass @ NLO**

\*\*\* **minimal realistic GUT @ NLO : renormalizable non-SUSY SO(10) with 126  $\oplus$  45**

- $\gggg$  only *perturbative* unified theory, with some classes of Planck scale operators (*gauge kinetic form*) under control  $\rightarrow$  can compute *radiative corrections* to masses and  $\tau_p$
- $\gggg$  genuinely *quantum* theory: no available *tree level* description (*tachyons*)  $\rightarrow$  **1-loop**

## References

- [1] L. Gráf, M. Malinský, T. Mede and V. Susič, arXiv:1611.01021 [hep-ph].
- [2] S. Bertolini, L. Di Luzio and M. Malinsky, Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 035015 [arXiv:0912.1796 [hep-ph]].
- [3] S. Bertolini, L. Di Luzio and M. Malinsky, Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012) 095014 [arXiv:1202.0807 [hep-ph]].
- [4] M. Yasue, Phys. Rev. D **24** (1981) 1005., M. Yasue, Phys. Lett. B **103** (1981) 33.
- [5] G. Anastaze, J. P. Derendinger and F. Buccella, Z. Phys. C **20** (1983) 269.
- [6] K. S. Babu and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **31** (1985) 2316.
- [7] S. R. Coleman and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7** (1973) 1888. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.7.1888